arXiv:1204.5859v1 [cs.LO] 26 Apr 2012

On the Complexity of Finding Second-Best Abductive Explanations

Paolo Liberatore
Marco Schaerf
Department of Computer, Control, and Management Engineering Antonio Ruberti
Sapienza Università di Roma
`liberato@dis.uniroma1.it, schaerf@dis.uniroma1.it`

Abstract

While looking for abductive explanations of a given set of manifestations, an ordering between possible solutions is often assumed. The complexity of finding/verifying optimal solutions is already known. In this paper we consider the computational complexity of finding second-best solutions. We consider different orderings, and consider also different possible definitions of what a second-best solution is.

1 Introduction

The three basic reasoning mechanisms used in computational logic are deduction, induction, and abduction [20]. Deduction is the process of drawing conclusions from information and assumptions representing our knowledge of the world, so that the fact "battery is down" together with the rule "if the battery is down, the car will not start" allows concluding "car will not start". Induction, on the other hand, derives rules from the facts: from the fact that the battery is down and that the car is not starting up, we may conclude the rule relating these two facts. Abduction is the inverse of deduction (to some extent [4]): from the fact that the car is not starting up, we conclude that the battery is down. Clearly, in a more complex environment there might be many explanations for a car not starting up. This is an important difference between abduction and deduction, making the former, in general, more computationally complex. Induction is similar to abduction in that it is still the process of inferring formulae that allow deriving the observations.

A given problem of abduction may have one, none, or even many possible solutions (explanations). Moreover, we need to perform both a consistency check and an inference just to verify an explanation. These facts intuitively explain why abduction is to be expected to be computationally harder than deduction. This observation has indeed been confirmed by theoretical results. Selman and Levesque [23, 22] and Bylander et al. [1, 2] proved the first results about fragments of abductive reasoning, Eiter and Gottlob [11] presented an extensive analysis, Creignou and Zanuttini [6] and Creignou, Schmidt, and Thomas [5] classified the complexity under two kinds of restrictions, Eiter and Makino [14, 15, 16] shown the complexity of computing all abductive explanations while Hermann and Pichler [17] proved the complexity of counting the number of solutions. All these results proved that abduction is, in general, harder than deduction. The analysis has also shown that several problems are of interest in abduction. Not only the problem of finding an explanation is relevant, but also the problems of checking an explanation, or whether a fact is in all, or some, of the explanations. Some work on the complexity of abduction from non-classical theories has also been done [13, 12].

Abduction is also related to the ATMS [7, 21] and to the set of prime implicates of a propositional formula. Indeed, Levesque [18] has proved that ATMS and prime implicates can be used to find the abductive explanations of a literal from a Horn theory. As a result, ATMS and algorithms for finding prime implicants of a formula can be seen as algorithms that solve the problem of abduction; moreover, finding the prime implicates can be seen as a preprocessing phase. Kernel resolution [8] exploits the particular literals of the observation to drive the clause generation process. Using this algorithm, Del Val has been able to derive upper bounds on the number of generated clauses, and to prove that some restricted classes of abduction problems are polynomial [10, 9].

Contrarily to deduction, abduction is driven by heuristics to best explain the given observations. This means that even if the best possible solution to a given problem is found, there is no warranty that it represent the actual state of the domain. As an example, a light bulb may not turn on because it is broken, but also because a complex set of circumstances caused a black out in the whole town; while the first explanation is more likely and should therefore be the preferred solution to the corresponding abduction problem, it may still be wrong. Therefore, it may make sense not to stop at the first explanation, or even at the set of all possible best explanations, but continue the search for other, less likely solutions.

In this article, we assume that a set of solutions to a given abduction problems are given, and the task is to find another one. Whenever an ordering of likeliness of explanations is given, these solutions are assumed to be among the best ones, and the task is to find another best explanation. The meaning of "another best" in this definition may take two meaning: in the first one, we exclude the given solutions and search for a best one among the remaining ones; in the second, we search for another best solution of the original (unrestricted) problem. A third class of problems is generated by the assumption that the search for the known solutions have produced some additional data that can be used while looking for another one. The complexity under such assumption can be established using compilability classes [3] and monotonic reductions [19].

2 Definitions

A problem of abduction is a triple $\langle H, M, T\rangle$, where H is a set of possible explanations, M is a set of manifestations, and T is a formula (or a set of formulas). Intuitively, T is a formula describing how the assumptions and manifestations are related. We know that a set of manifestations M occur, and we want to find the most likely explanation of this, where an explanation is a set of assumptions $H' \subseteq H$ such that $H' \cup T$ is consistent and $H' \cup T \models M$. As a result, we define the set of solutions of a problem of abduction as follows.

$$SOL(\langle H, M, T\rangle) = \{H' \subseteq H \mid H' \cup T \text{ is consistent and } H' \cup T \models M\}$$

It is easy to show instances having exponentially many solutions. Ideally, each instance should have a single solution, representing the set of assumptions that have – in the real world – caused the manifestations. At least, there should be a way for eliminating solutions that are known to be less likely than other ones.

To this extent, an ordering $\preceq$ over the subsets of H is defined. Intuitively, $H' \preceq H''$ should formalize the fact that H' is considered to be more likely than H''. A possible ordering is defined by $H' \preceq H''$ if and only if $|H'| \leq |H''|$. In other words, we prefer H' if and only if H' contains less assumptions than H''. Another possible ordering is obtained by assuming $H' \preceq H''$ if and only if $H' \subseteq H''$, that is, a set of assumptions contained in another one is more likely than it.

In order to remove unlikely solutions, we consider the set of minimal explanations w.r.t. a given ordering $\preceq$.

$$SOL_{\preceq}(\langle H, M, T\rangle) = \min(SOL(\langle H, M, T\rangle), \preceq)$$

2.1 Second-Best Solution

If our knowledge were perfect, the set of solutions would always be a singleton. In other words, for each set of manifestations we should be able to find the set of assumptions that caused the manifestations to happen. In general, such complete information is not available, so we end up with a set of candidate solutions we consider equally likely. As a result, once found a first element of this set, it makes sense to continue the search for other solutions.

The problem of finding a second-best solution is: given a set of minimal solutions of a problem of abduction, find another solution. We may or may not ask for minimality, leading to two different formulations.

$$\begin{array}{rcl} NEXT\_SOL(\langle H, M, T\rangle, \{H_1, \ldots, H_m\}) & = & SOL(\langle H, M, T\rangle) \backslash \{H_1, \ldots, H_m\}) \\ NEXT\_SOL_{\preceq}(\langle H, M, T\rangle, \{H_1, \ldots, H_m\}) & = & \min(NEXT\_SOL(\langle H, M, T\rangle, \{H_1, \ldots, H_m\}), \preceq) \end{array}$$

In both cases, we assume that the set of given solutions $\{H_1, \ldots, H_m\}$ can be recursively obtained by picking an element of $NEXT\_SOL$, that is,

$$\begin{array}{l} H_i \in NEXT\_SOL(\langle H, M, T\rangle, \{H_1, \ldots, H_{i-1}\}) \\ H_i \in NEXT\_SOL_{\preceq}(\langle H, M, T\rangle, \{H_1, \ldots, H_{i-1}\}) \end{array}$$

The first formula is equivalent to say that $H_i \in SOL(\langle H, M, T\rangle)$, while the second one formalizes the fact that H_i is one of the possible solutions obtained by the previous application of $SOL\_NEXT_{\preceq}$.

The problem we consider is the following one: given a candidate solution H', a problem of abduction $\langle H, M, T\rangle$ and a set of solutions $\{H_1, \ldots, H_m\}$, decide whether H' is in the set of next possible (or next minimal) solutions.

2.2 Other Best Solutions

The problem of the other best solution is, given a set of minimal solution, find another minimal solution (if it exists). This problem is different from the one of second best solution: indeed, a second best solution may be non-minimal (it is just the best solution among those different from the given ones). In other words, when looking for another best solution we want a minimal solution, whereas in the case of second best what is important is that the solution is minimal *relatively to the set of remaining solutions*.

In the case of no ordering, there is of course no difference between these two problems. In the case in which an ordering is defined, the problem can be formalized as follows.

$$MIN\_SOL_{\preceq}(P, \{H_1, \ldots, H_m\}) = SOL_{\preceq}(P) \backslash \{H_1, \ldots, H_m\}$$

The instance of the problem is composed of a problem P, a set $\{H_1, \ldots, H_m\}$, which is assumed $\{H_1, \ldots, H_m\} \subseteq SOL_{\preceq}(P)$ and a candidate solution $H' \subseteq H$ such that $H' \not\in \{H_1, \ldots, H_m\}$. We want to decide whether H' is a minimal solution or not.

2.3 Use of Additional Information

In the formulation of the two problems of second-best solutions and other-best solutions, we assumed that a solution is already known. This implies that there have been some computation leading to the find of this known solution. We assumed, however, that all is known from this piece of computation is the result, that is, the first solution. However, it may be that some intermediate results are useful for searching for other solutions. For instance, if we were able to prove (during the search for the first solution) that an assumption h is in *all* solutions of the problem, then the problem of checking other solution is simplified (i.e., if the candidate solution does not contains h, it is not a solution).

In general, we may assume that the result of the initial search is composed not only of the first solution, but also by some polynomial-sized data structure. The problem can thus be formalized as follows: given a triple $P = \langle H, M, T \rangle$, a set of previous solutions $\{H_1, \ldots, H_k\}$, is there a polynomial-sized data structure D, depending only on P and the known solutions, such that verifying whether H' is a second-best or other minimal solution is easier than the same check in which D is not known?

This problem cannot be solved using the standard complexity classes, because it involves a generic polynomial data structure D. On the other hand, this problem can be solved using the classes of compilability as defined by...

3 Second-Best Solution

In this section we consider the problem of the second-best solution, in the case in which exactly one optimal solution is already known. In other words, we assume that only one solution is available, and we are looking for a second choice. As usual, this search problem is turned into a verification problem in order to evaluate its complexity: given an instance of abduction, a set of solutions and a candidate solution, check whether the latter is a second-best solution.

The following lemma shows that we can introduce a new solution to a problem of abduction, without modifying the other ones. This is important to show hardness of the problems.

Lemma 1 *Let $P = \langle H, M, T \rangle$ be a problem of abduction, and let $P' = \langle H', M', T' \rangle$ be the following related problem.*

$$\begin{array}{rcl} H' & = & H \cup \{r, s\} \\ M' & = & M \cup \{t\} \\ T' & = & T \cup \{s \rightarrow m \mid m \in M \cup \{t\}\} \cup \{r \rightarrow t\} \cup \{\neg s \vee \neg h \mid h \in H\}\rangle \end{array}$$

The solutions of P and P' are related by the following formula.

$$SOL(P') = \{H' \cup \{r\} \mid H' \in SOL(P)\} \cup \{s\}$$

Proof. The statement $SOL(P) \cup \{s\} \subseteq SOL(P')$ is easy to prove. Indeed, $\{s\}$ is consistent with T', and $\{s\} \cup T'$ implies all manifestations thanks to the clauses $s \rightarrow m$ for each $m \in M'$. Moreover, if H' is a solution of P, then $H' \cup \{r\}$ is a solution of P' because no inconsistency is generated by the addition of t to H', and the new clauses in T'. Moreover, since $\{r\} \cup T \models t$, we are able to produce all manifestations in M'.

Let now consider the converse, that is, the only solution of P' that is not in the form $H' \cup \{r\}$ (where H' is a solution of P) is $\{s\}$. Let H'' be a solution of P'. Since t is a manifestation, and it appears in T only in the two clauses $s \rightarrow t$ and $r \rightarrow t$, and s and t does not appear positively in the other clauses of T', it follows that either $s \in H''$ or $t \in H''$. In the first case, since $H'' \cup T'$

is consistent, and T' contains the clauses $\neg s \vee \neg h$, it follows that H'' cannot contain any other assumption, that is $H'' = \{s\}$.

Let now consider the case $r \in H''$. We prove that $H'' \backslash \{r\}$ is a solution of P. First of all, $s \notin H''$. Since s appears only negatively in T', and is not in M', then both $H'' \cup T$ and $H'' \cup T \cup \neg M'$ can be simplified by assuming that s is false. Moreover, r is in H by assumption, thus these formulas can be modified accordingly. As a result, $H'' \cup T'$ is equivalent to the following formula.

$$H'' \cup \{r \rightarrow t\} \cup T$$

This is in turn equivalent to $H'' \cup \{t\} \cup T$. Since t does not appear in T, we can conclude that $(H'' \backslash \{r\}) \cup T$ is consistent, and implies M. $\square$

This lemma will be used to prove the some problems can be reduced to their corresponding second-best ones.

The first we consider is the one in which no ordering is considered.

Theorem 1 *The problem of checking whether* H' *is in* $NEXT\_SOL(\langle H, M, T \rangle, \{H_1, \ldots, H_m\})$ *is* D^p*-complete.*

Proof. The problem is in D^p because it can be solved by first checking whether $H' \in SOL(\langle H, M, T \rangle)$ and then whether H' is different from every set in $\{H_1, \ldots, H_m\}$.

Hardness is a consequence of Lemma 1, where $\{s\}$ is used as the already-known solution: $H'' \in SOL(\langle H, M, T \rangle)$ if and only if $H'' \in NEXT\_SOL(\langle H, M, T \rangle, \{s\})$. $\square$

We now turn to the set containment order.

Theorem 2 *The problem of checking whether* $H' \in NEXT\_SOL_{\subseteq}(\langle H, M, T \rangle, \{H_1, \ldots, H_m\}))$ *is* Π^p_2*-complete.*

Proof. Memership is proved as follows: H' satisfies the condition in the statement of the problem if it is in $SOL(\langle H, M, R \rangle)$ and for every $H'' \subset H'$ it holds that either $T \cup H''$ is inconsistent, $T \cup H'' \not\models M$ or $H'' = H_i$ for some i.

Hardness is proved by Lemma 1. Apart from $\{s\}$, the solutions of $\langle H', M', T' \rangle$ are of the form $H'' \cup \{r\}$, where H'' is a solution of $\langle H, M, T \rangle$. As a result, minimal solutions of $\langle H, M, T \rangle$ are mapped into minimal solutions of $\langle H', M', T' \rangle$. In other words, s is introducted as a new minimal solution, therefore $NEXT\_SOL_{\subseteq}(\langle H', T', M' \rangle, \{\{s\}\})$ is the same as $SOL_{\subseteq}(\langle H', T', M' \rangle)$, apart from the addition of r to every solution. $\square$

Let $\leq$ be the ordering of solution defined by cardinality. The following theorem shows a result similar to the previous one.

Theorem 3 *The problem of checking whether* $H' \in NEXT\_SOL_{\leq}(\langle H, M, T \rangle, \{H_1, \ldots, H_m\}))$ *is* Π^p_2*-complete.*

Proof. Membership is proved as follows: H' satisfies the condition in the statement of the problem if it is in $SOL(\langle H, M, R \rangle)$ and for every H'' such that $|H''| < |H'|$ it holds that either $T \cup H''$ is inconsistent, $T \cup H'' \not\models M$ or $H'' = H_i$ for some i.

Hardness is proved by reduction: H'' is a minimal solution of a problem if $H'' \cup \{r\}$ is a second best solution of another problem, given one of its minimal solutions.

In particular, we use the reduction of Lemma 1, using $\{s\}$ as the minimal known solution. As the lemma proves, $\{s\}$ is indeed a solution, and is also among its minimal ones because all other ones (if any) have the form $H \cup \{r\}$, so they have cardinality larger or equal than it.

The lemma also proves that every solution to the original problem is translated into a solution of the generated one. This reduction preserves the relative size of explanations, as they are all added one element. As a result, the solutions are not only all translated, but maintain their relative size. Therefore, $H'' \cup \{r\} \in NEXT\_SOL(\langle H', M', T' \rangle, \{\{s\}\})$ holds if and only if $H'' \in SOL_{\leq}(\langle H, M, T \rangle)$ holds. $\Box$

4 Other Minimal Solution

Here we consider the problem of deciding whether H' is a minimal solution, given some other minimal solutions. The problem is different from the one of second best solution: indeed, a second best solution may be non-minimal (it is just the best solution among those different from the given ones).

In the case of no ordering, as explained, the problem of second best solution and the problem of other minimal solution coincide.

In the case of set containment, it is also easy to prove that the complexity does not decrease. Indeed, the reduction used in the previous section introduce a new minimal solution $\{s\}$, and minimal solutions of P are mapped into other minimal solutions of P'. As a result, we have a reduction from the problem of minimal solution to the problem of other minimal solutions.

In the case of cardinality used as ordering, the problem becomes easier. Indeed, in order to decide whether H' is a second minimal solution of $P = \langle H, M, R \rangle$, given another minimal solution H'', we can check whether $|H'| = |H''|$, and then $H' \cup T$ is consistent and $H' \cup T \models M$. Consider the two problems:

1. decide whether H' is consistent with T and $|H'| = |H''|$;
2. decide whether $H' \cup T \models M$.

Then, H' is another minimal solution of the problem if and only if it satisfies both condition. Since the first problem is in NP, and the second one is in coNP, it follows that the problem is in D^p.

The only open problem at this point is to prove that deciding whether a solution is another minimal solution in the case of $\leq$ is D^p-hard. The following lemma shows how to relate the solutions of a problem to the minimal solutions of another problem. This property will be used to prove that we can reduce the problem of checking a solution to the problem of checking another minimal solution.

Lemma 2 *Let $P = \langle H, M, T \rangle$ be a problem of abduction, and let $P' = \langle H', M', T' \rangle$ be the problem defined as follows, where C, D, and E are sets of new variables in one-to-one correspondence with the variable in H.*

$$\begin{aligned} H' &= C \cup D \\ M' &= M \cup E \\ T' &= \{c_i \to h_i, c_i \to e_i, d_i \to e_i\} \cup T \end{aligned}$$

It holds:

$$SOL_{\leq}(\langle H', M', T' \rangle) = \{\{c_i \mid h_i \in H_1\} \cup \{d_i \mid h_i \not\in H_1\} \mid H_1 \in SOL(\langle H, M, T \rangle)\}$$

In other words, each solution of P is mapped into a minimal solution of P', and vice versa.

Proof. First of all, T' does not contain any positive occurrence of c_i and d_i. Since e_i is in the set of manifestations, any solution of P' contains either c_i or d_i. It is also easy to see that any minimal solution contains exactly one element in $\{c_i, d_i\}$ for any i: indeed, if a solution contains both c_i and d_i, the latter can be removed, leading to a solution with less assumptions. As a result, the minimal solutions of P' contains exactly $|H|$ assumptions.

Given a solution H_1 of P, we can obtain a solution of P' as follows:

$$H_2 = \{c_i \mid h_i \in H_1\} \cup \{d_i \mid h_i \not\in H_1\}$$

This is a solution because each c_i implies the corresponding h_i. This solution is also minimal because it contains exactly $|H|$ assumptions.

Let us prove the converse, that is, if H_2 is a solution of P, then we can obtain a solution H_1 of P as follows.

$$H_1 = \{h_i \mid c_i \in H_2\}$$

This is also easy to prove: indeed, P does not contain any e_i, thus the clauses containing e_i can be disregarded, leading to a set of clauses not containing any d_i. As a result, what is left is a set of clauses $c_i \rightarrow h_i$, plus T. Clearly, we can replace any c_i with the corresponding h_i, leading to a solution of P. □

Using the above lemma is easy to prove that the problem of other minimal solution with $\leq$ is D^p-hard. Indeed, we first use the reduction of Lemma 1 to reduce a problem of checking a solution to the problem of checking a second-best solution with no ordering. Then, we use the above lemma to map solutions of this problem into minimal (w.r.t. $\leq$) other solution of another problem.

Corollary 1 *The problem of checking another minimal solution (w.r.t. $\leq$) is D^p-complete.*

5 Using Additional Information

During the search for the first solution, some useful information can be stored, allowing a faster search for the other solution. The complexity under such assumption can be evaluated using compilability classes [3] and monotonic and self reductions [19].

We consider the case in which we are looking for another minimal solution. We begin with the case of no ordering.

Lemma 3 *Let $P = \langle H, M, T \rangle$ a problem of abduction and $H_1 \subseteq H$. We show a self reduction: let H_2 and $P' = \langle H', M', T' \rangle$ be defined as follows.*

$$\begin{aligned} H_2 &= H_1 \cup \{c_i \mid \gamma_i \in T\} \\ H' &= H \cup C \\ M' &= M \\ T' &= \{c_i \rightarrow \gamma_i \mid \gamma_i \in \Pi_n\} \end{aligned}$$

Here $n = |Var(T)|$, and C is a set of variables in one-to-one correspondence with H. It holds:

$$H_1 \in SOL(\langle H, M, T \rangle) \text{ iff } H_2 \in SOL(\langle H', M', T' \rangle)$$

Proof. The first part of the proof is that $H_1 \cup T$ is consistent if and only if $H_2 \cup T'$ is consistent. By simple application of modus ponens, we obtain:

$$H_2 \cup T' \equiv H_1 \cup \{c_i \mid \gamma_i \in T\} \cup T \cup \{c_i \rightarrow \gamma_i \mid \gamma_i \in \Pi_n \backslash T\}$$

We note that each c_i appears only once (in the unit clause c_i if $\gamma_i \in T$, and in the clause $c_i \rightarrow \gamma_i$ if $\gamma_i \notin T$). As a result, we can eliminate all clauses in which the appear, without modifying the consistency of the formula. As a result, we obtain that $H_2 \cup T'$ is consistent if and only if $H_1 \cup T$ is consistent.

The second part of the proof is to prove that $H_1 \cup T \cup \neg M$ is consistent if and only if $H_2 \cup T' \cup \neg M$ is consistent. This can be shown in the same way. Indeed, we have:

$$H_2 \cup T' \cup \neg M \equiv H_1 \cup \{c_i \mid \gamma_i \in T\} \cup T \cup \{c_i \rightarrow \gamma_i \mid \gamma_i \in \Pi_n \backslash T\} \cup \neg M$$

The formula in the right-hand side of this equivalence contains each c_i only once (because no c_i appears in M), thus we can remove all clauses containing c_i, thus obtaining $H_1 \cup T \cup \neg M$, which proves the claim. □

A reduction satisfying representative equivalence can be obtained by adding a suitable number of possible assumptions, or a suitable number of tautological clauses with new variables. As a result, we have characterized the property of checking solutions w.r.t. compilability.

Theorem 4 *The problem of deciding whether $H_1 \in SOL(\langle H, M, T \rangle)$ is $\|\!\!\leadsto \mathrm{D}^p$-complete.*

Proof. We assume, without loss of generality, that the variables of formula T are taken from three disjoint alphabets H, M, and X. We may also assume that the cardinality of these three sets are equal, that is, $|H| = |M| = |X|$.

Indeed, if for instance the cardinality of X is less than the cardinality of the two other sets, we can add new tautological clauses $x_i \vee \neg x_i$ to T without modifying its sets of models. If the set of manifestations has fewer elements that the other two, we can also add new manifestations m_i to it: if each added m_i is also added to T, then the set of solutions is not modified. Finally, if the number of assumptions is too small, then we can add new assumptions $h_i, \ldots, h_m$ to H, and then adding a new manifestation m to M, and the clause $h_i \wedge \cdots \wedge h_m \rightarrow m$. It is easy to see that the solutions of the new problem are simply the solutions of the original one, plus $h_i, \ldots, h_m$.

Given a instance $I = \langle H', \langle H, M, T \rangle \rangle$ of the problem of abduction, its class is given by:

$$Class(I) = |H| - 1 = |M| - 1 = |Var(T) \backslash (H \cup M)| - 1$$

The representative instance of the class m is given by:

$$Repr(m) = \langle \emptyset, \langle H, M, \Pi(H, M, X) \rangle \rangle$$

where $H = \{h_1, \ldots, h_m\}$, $M = \{m_1, \ldots, m_m\}$, and $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$. The extension function is obtained by adding a suitable number of assumptions, manifestations, and other variables, to the instance.

$$\begin{aligned} Ext(I, m) \quad = \quad & \langle H' \cup \{h_{n+1}, \ldots, h_{m+1}\}, \langle H \cup \{h_{n+1}, \ldots, h_{m+1}\}, M \cup \{m_{n+1}, \ldots, m_{m+1}\}, \\ & T \cup \{x_{n+1} \vee \neg x_{n+1}, \ldots, x_{m+1} \vee \neg x_{m+1}\} \cup \{h_{n+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge h_{m+1} \rightarrow m_{n+1}\} \cup \\ & \{m_{n+2}, \ldots, m_{m+1}\} \rangle \rangle \end{aligned}$$

It can be proved that $Ext(I, m)$ is equivalent to I. Indeed, new assumptions are introduced, which are forced to be true. There are new tautological clauses, and the new manifestations are forced to be true in T. As a result, the solutions of the new instances are obtained by adding $\{h_{n+1}, \ldots, h_{m+1}\}$ to a solution of the original instance.

We have thus proved that there exists the three functions for the problem of abduction. Note that the result holds for any meaningful ordering, thus it holds for the cases of no ordering, set-containment, and cardinality. In all these cases, a reduction satisfying representative equivalence implies hardness of the problem. The reduction of the previous lemma is indeed as reduction satisfying representative equivalence, thus we have proved the claim. $\square$

For the case in which the ordering $\subseteq$ is used, the following lemma helps.

Lemma 4 *Given $P = \langle H, M, T\rangle$ and $H_1 \subseteq H$, construct P' and H_2 as follows.*

$$\begin{array}{rcl} H_2 & = & H_1 \cup \{c_i \mid \gamma_i \in T\} \cup \{d_i \mid \gamma_i \not\in T\} \\ H' & = & H \cup C \cup D \\ M' & = & M \cup E \\ T' & = & \{c_i \rightarrow e_i\} \cup \{d_i \rightarrow e_i\} \cup \{c_i \rightarrow \gamma_i \mid \gamma_i \in \Pi_n\} \end{array}$$

The sets C, D, and E are sets new variables in one-to-one correspondence with H, while n denotes the number of variables in T. It holds:

$$H_1 \in SOL_{\subseteq}(\langle H, M, T\rangle) \textit{ iff } H_2 \in SOL_{\subseteq}(\langle H', M', T'\rangle)$$

Proof. Proving that H_1 is a solution of the first problem if and only if H_2 is a solution of the second one is straightforward. What is left to prove is minimality.

No c_i or d_i can be removed from H_2: indeed, if there exists i such that $c_i, d_i \not\in H_3$, then H_3 is not a solution because e_i is not implied by $H_3 \cup T'$.

Finally, it is easy to show that a variable h_i can be removed from H_2 (leading to a new solution of P') if and only if the same variable can be removed from H_1 (leading to a new solution of P). This can be proved by noting that $H_1 \cup T$ is equivalent to $H_2 \cup T'$ relatively to the manifestations (that is, consistency is guaranteed, as well as implication of any subset of M). Another possible proof is by showing that the sets of solutions of P and P' are the same (apart from the mapping). Then, minimality is guaranteed by the fact that $\subseteq$ is preserved by the mapping). This proves the claim. $\square$

The following theorem shows that the case of set-containment is not different from the case of no ordering, in the sense that complexity does not decrease by compiling $\langle H, M, T\rangle$.

Theorem 5 *The problem of checking solutions using $\subseteq$ is $\|\!\!\leadsto\mathrm{C}$-hard for any class C for which it is C-hard.*

Proof. The classification, representative, and extension functions are the same as in the proof of the previous theorem. The reduction of the previous lemma satisfies the condition of representative equivalence, thus we have proved the claim. $\square$

In the case in which the ordering is $\leq$, the problem is $\|\!\!\leadsto\mathrm{D}^p$-complete. Indeed, once known $\langle H, M, T\rangle$, we can check the size of the minimal solutions, and then using this number to determine whether a set of assumptions is a minimal solution. Hardness is proved by defining a comp reduction from the problem of abduction with no ordering to the problem using $\leq$: this is simply defined as the reduction that makes all solutions to have the same size.

Theorem 6 *Checking whether a solution is minimal w.r.t. to* $\leq$ *is* $\|\!\!\leadsto\mathrm{D}^p$*-complete.*

6 Conclusions

In this article, we have investigated the problem of finding a solution to a given abduction problem given some other ones. There are some open questions and some possible future directions of work.

The complexity of the case of second-best solutions has not been established in the case where other information is available. Also, it makes sense to establish the complexity of finding a k-th best solution, at least in the case of ordering based on cardinality. This can be seen as a variant of the problems studied in this article where the given solutions are not known.

Another question left open by this article is to find a reduction from the problem of second-best solutions to simple abduction that preserve the explanations. What is needed is the opposite of Lemma 1, which shows how to add a given explanation to an abduction problem: a reduction that eliminates some given solutions from an abduction problem while leaving the other ones unchanged.

There are also some variants of the problems that take into account the reason why the given solutions are not satisfying: other manifestations, perhaps more costly to evaluate, can tell that these are not the actual state of the world; more generally, there may be some additional information explaining why the given solution are not valid, so that the search has to continue.

References

[1] T. Bylander, D. Allemang, M. C. Tanner, and J. R. Josephson. Some results concerning the computational complexity of abduction. In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on the Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning (KR'89)*, pages 44–54, 1989.

[2] T. Bylander, D. Allemang, M. C. Tanner, and J. R. Josephson. The computational complexity of abduction. *Artificial Intelligence*, 49:25–60, 1991.

[3] M. Cadoli, F. M. Donini, P. Liberatore, and M. Schaerf. Preprocessing of intractable problems. *Information and Computation*, 176(2):89–120, 2002.

[4] M. Cialdea Mayer and F. Pirri. Abduction is not deduction-in-reverse. *Journal of the IGPL*, 4(1):86–104, 1996.

[5] N. Creignou, J. Schmidt, and M. Thomas. Complexity of propositional abduction for restricted sets of boolean functions. In *KR-2010*, 2010.

[6] N. Creignou and B. Zanuttini. A complete classification of the complexity of propositional abduction. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 36(1):207–229, 2006.

[7] J. de Kleer. An assumption-based TMS. *Artificial Intelligence*, 28:127–162, 1986.

[8] A. Del Val. A new method for consequence finding and compilation in restricted languages. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI'99)*, pages 259–264, 1999.

[9] A. Del Val. The complexity of restricted consequence finding and abduction. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI 2000)*, pages 337–342, 2000.

[10] A. Del Val. On some tractable classes in deduction and abduction. *Artificial Intelligence*, 116:297–313, 2000.

[11] T. Eiter and G. Gottlob. The complexity of logic-based abduction. *Journal of the ACM*, 42(1):3–42, 1995.

[12] T. Eiter, G. Gottlob, and N. Leone. Abduction from logic programs: Semantics and complexity. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 189:129–177, 1997.

[13] T. Eiter, G. Gottlob, and N. Leone. Semantics and complexity of abduction from default theories. *Artificial Intelligence*, 90:177–223, 1997.

[14] T. Eiter and K. Makino. On computing all abductive explanations. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI 2002)*, pages 62–67, 2002.

[15] T. Eiter and K. Makino. Abduction and the dualization problem. In *Discovery Science*, pages 1–20, 2003.

[16] T. Eiter and K. Makino. Generating all abductive horn theories. In *Seventeenth International Workshop on Computer Science Logic*, pages 197–211, 2003.

[17] M. Hermann and R. Pichler. Counting complexity of propositional abduction. In *IJCAI-2007*, pages 417–422, 2007.

[18] H. J. Levesque. A knowledge-level account of abduction. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI'89)*, pages 1061–1067, 1989.

[19] P. Liberatore. Monotonic reductions, representative equivalence, and compilation of intractable problems. *Journal of the ACM*, 48(6):1091–1125, 2001.

[20] C. S. Peirce. Abduction and induction. In J. Buchler, editor, *Philosophical Writings of Peirce*, chapter 11, pages 150–156. Dover, New York, 1955.

[21] R. Reiter and J. de Kleer. Foundations of assumption-based truth maintenace systems: Preliminary report. In *Proceedings of the Sixth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI'87)*, pages 183–188, 1987.

[22] B. Selman and H. Levesque. Support set selection for abductive and default reasoning. *Artificial Intelligence*, 82:259–272, 1996.

[23] B. Selman and H. J. Levesque. Abductive and default reasoning: A computational core. In *Proceedings of the Eighth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI'90)*, pages 343–348, 1990.